

The Principia.

First Principles in Religion, Morals, Government, and the Economy of Life.

VOL. II.—No. 35.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JULY 13, 1861.

WHOLE NUMBER 87.

The Principia

Published Weekly, at 310 Pearl Street, (two doors above
Harpers' Buildings) New-York.

WILLIAM GOSWELL, Editor.

SAMUEL WILLS, Proprietor.

TERMS: One Dollar a year, in advance.

Direct business letters, with remittances, to

MELANCTHON B. WILLIAMS, Publishing Agent,
as above.

PROSPECTUS.

Our object in publishing this, is to promote pure religion, sound moral-Christian reform, the abolition of slaveholding, caste, the run-truffe, and kindred criminal application of Christian principles to all the relations, social, political, and domestic, and aims of life—the individual, the family, the Church, the State, the Nation—in a word of converting the world to God, restoring the common brotherhood of man, and rendering Society the type of heaven. Our text book is the Bible—our standard, the Divine Law—our expediency, abundance, our plan, the Gospel—our trust, the Divine promise; our pauperly, the whole armor of God.

Send Editors freely, please copy, or notice.

REVIEW OF THE RESULT OF THE EX-PARTE COUNCIL, ON THE CHURCH OF THE PURITANS.

[Concluded.]

Not against Dr. Cheever and the Church of the Puritans alone, has this bitter gill of the two leading spirits of the ex-parte council been expended, though the "metropolitan" position, and "high places" of these, be indeed rendered them specially obnoxious, and singled them out as a conspicuous mark. There lives not the clergyman in the non-slaveholding States, so gifted, so venerated, or so popular, as to have escaped the open or covert opposition of these same clerical gentlemen, had he not committed the same offence of denouncing with equal scriptural severity, the *inherent sinfulness of slaveholding*, insisting with equal seal and eloquence, on the Christian duty of excommunication, of the flagitious man-thieves from the sacred fellowship of the saints. A mere allusion to a single instance of their editorial tactics will justify this charge, by showing that it is against the *entire class of reformers* to which Dr. Cheever and the Church of the Puritans belong, that their systematic, and persistent warfare has, all along, been directed—notwithstanding their solicitude to share with them or to flinch from them, not the *reproaches*, but the *honors* of their labors.

Doctors Bacon and Thompson probably, will not deny that when, in 1856, the late Dr. Taylor of New Haven, landed the old Whig party by saying, "Whiggery and abolitionism had no fellowship, they were political adversaries; the abolition of slavery never was a doctrine of the Whig party"—and when, in the same connection, he urged the support of a certain party that had succeeded the Whig, on the ground that it was "the only means of giving abolitionism proper, so profound a burial that it shall disturb no"—the article was published in their *Independent*, with high editorial eulogiums, and "thanks to God who had given him grace to make that declaration"—that this was done by the editors, *without any expressions of dissent from the sentiments above quoted* although they did take sides, *freely*, to object to the honor done to modern abolitionists, by calling them *abolitionists proper*, and thus identifying them with honored names of the previous century. So that all the honors to be ultimately derived from "abolitionism" as well as "anti-slavery" are to be monopolized by those who can win in their own localities, and during the struggle, consent to bear the reproach of it, the loss of salaries, and the desertion of pews.

Whether the controlling editors of *The Independent*, who figured so conspicuously in the ex-parte council, were really in harmony with Dr. Cheever and the Church of the Puritans, on the "issue between slavery and anti-slavery," our readers may now judge. Assuming such to have been the

fact, they will also judge, not only whether it was *proper* but whether it would be *natural*, or *credible*, that they could act in judgment on the case presented to them by the minority, without making any inquiry into the connection of their "grievances" with the controversy concerning "slavery and anti-slavery" which everybody, almost, knows to have existed in the Church of the Puritans.

Whether agreeing or disagreeing with Dr. Cheever and his supporters on the "issue between slavery and anti-slavery" it became them, as impartial judges in the case, and even out of a prudent regard to common decency, to inquire into the *origin and animus* of the "grievances" claiming redress.

We do not know that the council did not thoroughly catch the minority on the origin of the difficulties. We do not know that the minority did not give the council full and adequate information. But if they did, we cannot understand how the council could say that "the difficulties which have passed under their review, have involved no issue between slavery and anti-slavery."

We will make the supposition that, in reply to suitable interrogatories of the council, the following statements or admissions should have been elicited from the minority, namely,

1. That seventeen of the more wealthy members of the church and society, being dissatisfied by the preaching of Dr. Cheever on the "issue between slavery and anti-slavery," requested him, privately, to resign the pastorate, that they were still farther displeased, because he declined to comply with their wishes, but laid the matter before the church, and that most, or all of them left the church and society in consequence, *previous* to Feb. 1859, at which date, the Result of the council commences its history of the difficulties.

2. That Mr. Charles Abernethy, (the treatment of whom, by the majority of the church, constitutes one of the charges acted upon by the council), was Treasurer of the church in 1858, and up to 1st of April 1859, that on several occasions, during those years, in his intercourse with one from whom he was receiving pew rent, he talked against Dr. Cheever's course in preaching against slavery, said that it would ruin the church, that it could not be sustained with such preaching, that Dr. C. must stop, or go away: or that those who agreed with him could go into the Lecture Room, which would hold all that liked such preaching, that he (Mr. Abernethy) was no abolitionist, and never had been one—that this was before, and also after Miss Johnson went to England, and before anything was known, in the church, of any effort by individuals, to save the church, by raising money in England.

3. That when, in 1859, the church was declared to be out of debt, it was so declared on the faith of subscriptions of the previously dissatisfied, a part of which has never been paid—that Mr. Charles Abernethy's subscription of \$250, March 12, 1859, was refused payment by him, and is not yet paid.

4. That Mr. Charles Abernethy and others, as early as Feb. 1859, when they knew nothing of the efforts of individual members to raise money in England, endeavored to discourage and embarrass the church, in its general financial operations.

5. That the meeting to elect new Trustees was held about 1st of April 1860. That the old board of Trustees, who were then about to be superseded, having a majority in opposition to Dr. Cheever, a few days before they were to pass out of office, passed a resolution, authorizing their President, Mr. Abernethy, to so endorse the pew deeds, that no forfeitures of pews should accrue, though the assessments upon them should be unpaid,—thus annulling the agreement originally inserted in those deeds, which bound

the pew-owners to pay assessments on their pews, for the support of the gospel, or forfeit the pews—and thus annulling dissatisfied pew holders to refuse paying their assessments, destroy the income of the church, starve out Dr. Cheever, and yet hold their pews. That the said Trustees did not report to the society, this official, yet unauthorized action of theirs, but an acknowledgment of the fact was drawn out of them at the annual meeting (calling the council) told the society that the thing was done, that the society could not help it, and must submit to it. That the society at once passed a vote, repudiating the action of the Trustees, and forbidding the President to make any such endorsements, thus preventing the church and society from being broken down by the movement.

6. That soon after the Old Board of Trustees learned that an effort was making in Great Britain to help the Church of the Puritans sustain Dr. Cheever, a meeting of the Trustees was held, when, after pledging themselves that no publication should be made of their action, the majority of the Board passed a vote censuring the "British Aid Mission;" that this was late in the evening, and, the same night, the vote of censure was placed in the hands of Rev. J. P. Thompson D. D., and appeared in *The Independent*, the next day.

Suppose the Council had asked the minority for a full history of the difficulties from the beginning, and suppose the minority had communicated all they knew, would not some such facts as these have been before the ex-parte Council? Was there not one member of that Council, and a prominent one, who was cognizant of, at least, some of those facts, sufficient to have restrained him from representing that the difficulties in that Church had nothing to do with "the issue between slavery and anti-slavery?"

In view of such facts, if indeed, (as we are well certified) they are facts, was the Church of the Puritans in fault, for suspending such members from their communion? Was it not rather, their mistake, that they had not excommunicated them, long before, and thus saved themselves from the evils that their forbearance has occasioned? Would it not likewise have been well, if, when "scenes of disorder" occurred, in the Church or Society meetings, a few of the more respectable ring leaders of "the row" had been lodged, by the Police, in the watch-house, as was done when an attempt was made, by kindred, but more manly spirits, to silence Dr. Cheever's voice, by open violence, at the Cooper Institute?

If any one should be horrified at the monstrosity of the implication that Church members of high social position in "the high places of the metropolis" could possibly be guilty of mobocratic disorder at religious meetings wherein "issues" concerning "slavery and anti-slavery" were involved, and yet find titled ecclesiastics to sympathize with, and vindicate them, we refer them to *The Independent's* account of the famous meeting of the New-York American Tract Society up town, among the upper ten, not many years since. There was "no redeeming feature" of that degradation. No pretences of fraternity and of a title for the cause of "anti-slavery" were known.

To those who have known us, we have a firmer trust than a parent of a century past, the colonialist and in common use, in this country, for putting down honest, earnest abolitionism in the Churches, and in the ministry, their proceedings will excite no surprise—no, not even the "pious pretence" that "no issue between slavery and anti-slavery" was involved in the difficulties. This, excepting in a few exceptional instances, has been the stereotyped phraseology from the beginning. In no other way could the religious public have been persuaded to tolerate such persecutions. We repeat it, this latest assault, is but a specimen of scores if not

hundreds that have preceded it, only that the majority of a prominent city Church, instead of obscure individual and minorities, has been now marked out for the proscription.

We see, in this instance, but a single specimen, though a conspicuous one, of the numerous cases that have preceded it. We regard it but a part of the systematic war carried on, by leading ecclesiastics, against the cause of abolition since 1833. That war, except at an early date, has been carried on, chiefly, by pretended friends of the cause. With more open, namely, and out-spoken enemies we have had comparatively little trouble. It was only under the pretence of being "as much opposed to slavery as any body" that, by false accusations, mobs could be got up against us, giving rise to the current parody upon the Colonization orators—I am as much of an abolitionist as you are: but if you are as much of an abolitionist as I am, you ought to be mobbed." In proportion as they were laughed out of this folly, their power against abolitionism declined. Attempts to procure state legislation against us, were prosecuted by the same arts, and failed because legislators discovered the cheatery and despised it, knowing that "for every chief priest" had conspired against us. Dr. Romben Grandall, when prosecuted for the crime of abolitionism by *Francis S. Key, Esq.*, the Colonizationist orator, and District Attorney at Washington City, was saved from condemnation and capital punishment, by the fact, brought out in the trial, by the Council for the accused, that the prosecutor himself had professed opposition to slavery. The Journal of Commerce and N. Y. Observer have given as little trouble since they exchanged their pretended opposition to slavery for open defenses of it. So long as the Whig party could afford to claim that it was "the only true anti-slavery party" it absorbed the anti-slavery vote, and kept its nose above water. When its Southern wing compelled it to abandon that race, it declined, and became extinct.

No man living, knows, more scientifically or more practically than does Dr. Bacon the indispensable necessity of anti-slavery profession to a successful warfare against abolitionism. The Independent, under his skilful leadership, takes the place once occupied by the N. Y. Observer and Journal of Commerce, and does the work that they have lost the power of doing.

From the citadel of *The Independent*, in this "high place of our national metropolis" he shoots forth his missiles of assault against abolitionism, under the shelter of anti-slavery profession. The knight is not without his devoted *Sanche Panza*. Instead of mistaking a windmill for a giant, he mistakes a giant for a Lilliputian, and expects to silence the artillery of God's word against slaveholders by his ex-parte bulls and paper pop-guns. When the pillars of the Divine throne begin to tremble, then look out for the signs of his success.

How long will men halt between two opinions, trying to find a middle ground between right and wrong? How long deny the sinfulness of slaveholding without proclaiming its innocency and Divine warranty? How long claim for it a seat at the communion table, without claiming for it the protection of Government wherever the national flag floats?

Behold the legitimate fruits of the "neither cold nor hot" school of professed "anti-slavery" in the matured demands of the slaveholders! What Doctors Bacon and Thompson say is *not sinful*; they infer must be *innocent*, and if innocent entitled to protection; for what is a Government good for, that does not protect the innocent?

Admitting the premises, how shall we avoid the conclusion? with the *Leonard Baconian* philosophy for a starting point, with the *Joseph P. Thompsonian* dispensatory of moral and political medicine for the body politic, what but rampant pro-slavery rebellion could be the result?

The fact is upon us in sober earnest. It is justified by the very process of reasoning we have described. And how do the teachers of the new philosophy greet their disciples? Why, they denounce them as rebels and join with the populace in denouncing that they be put down with fire arms and cold steel. They understand that the rebels and the slaveholders are, for one must pass identical. They know that rebellion is claimed by the Southern Churches and Ministry as the fruit and outgrowth of their religion, and that there is no lack of pious rebel slaveholding chaplains for the rebel army.

How do they treat their dear Christian brethren of the

South? whose fraternity they have so long cherished, crying out against the uncharitable slaveholders who would exclude them from Christian fellowship?—Why, as "rebels" they would meet them with leaden bullets and gun powder—*as Christian slaveholders* they would, on the first opportunity, invite them to their communion tables, and exchange pulpits with them.

No marvel that they are for withdrawing fellowship from the Church of the Puritans!—With all their other fellowships, Northern and Southern, from New Orleans to Boston, from Dr. Palmer to Dr. Adams, it would be manifestly incongruous in them to do otherwise. We congratulate the "unsected" Church and Pastor on "Union Square," on their deliverance from the pretended "fraternity of all such." That mask has, not too soon, been broken aside. It strikes that the only ground of crushing out the "almost universally repudiated principle of church discipline which excommunicates slaveholders," by breaking down Dr. Cheever and the Church of the Puritans with the weight of a general excommunication by the Congregational churches, was precipitated upon Doctors Bacon and Thompson, at a most unfortunate crisis, when the entire loyal portion of the country, is earnestly engaged in a civil war to put down a rebellion against the Government, a rebellion instigated, headed, and carried on, by the leading ministers and main body of Church members of the South, for the avowed purpose of protecting, extending, and perpetuating slavery—a time when the enthusiasm for putting down, by force of arms, the "Christian" slaveholding traitors is so overwhelming as to draw into its wake the most conservative and dignified Doctors of Divinity in the country, including even those who do not make professions of being "anti-slavery"—an enthusiasm that has had to find expression, even in *The Independent* itself, and has almost driven it into an advocacy of a national abolition of slavery, the most ultra form of radical abolition extant, so far as political action is concerned. Is the heresy of the inherent sinfulness of slaveholding, and of excommunicating slaveholders to be visited with excommunication, in a crisis like this?

The culmination of the great national "issue between slavery and anti-slavery" identical with the culmination of the long warfare between Dr. Bacon's type of "anti-slavery" and Dr. Cheever's type of abolition. An unfortunate coincidence for the ex-parte council and its friends! There is a power that takes the wise in their own craftiness and brings the council's unrighteousness to confusion. The fate of the "slaveholding Christian" reb is will be the disgrace of their teachers and apologists, the downfall of the sophistries that have flattered, deceived and destroyed them.

This foul pro-slavery rebellion is to be put down by Northern steel, and yet the rebels welcomed, heretofore, to Northern communion tables and Northern pulpits!—Nor—if a distinction is to be drawn, in the enlightened public mind, between the sins of rebellion and of slaveholding, will the latter, the guilty cause and hateful animus of the former, be accounted less heinous than its natural effect—the latter. If the rebellion is to be, in reality, put down, it is to be put down by a people thoroughly convinced, by the process, if not otherwise, of the inherent sinfulness of slaveholding! The nation and the world are to be left in the moral darkness of believing in the *innocent innocence* in this country, both in ecclesiastics and in politicians—the church and in state—as manifested in the terrible developments of A.D. 1861. Nor will the attempt to expunge the capital and drive away the President, be accounted, fifty years hence, a more disgraceful or a more wicked procedure than the attempt to drive away Dr. Cheever, and get possession of the church of the Puritans.

The demon of slavery, if driven out, by a bloody war from the nation, is not to find fellowship in the pulpits and communion tables of the churches—nor are those who have expiated their lives in sheltering it, to escape the condemnation of posterity—much less will they be able to succeed in ex-communicating the faithful CHURCHES of the context, that they may flee their place of slavery and reap their rewards.

On the other hand, if the war should close without purging out the great national sin of which the war is both the out-growth and the punishment—if the religion of innocent, pious slaveholding should triumph in the camp, as it had

before triumphed at the communion table, or in the Cabinet as it had before triumphed in ecclesiastical assemblies, if innocent slaveholding, with its sacred and passport, should find Congressional and Presidential protection, and in every State and Territory of the Union, if slaveholding Christianity's type of "Freedom of speech and of the press" should be extended over the whole country, and reign in all the Churches, under the amended Constitution proposed by the late Congress, and endorsed by two Presidents—if all this should be the result of the present struggle, it will come as a triumph over "the almost universally repudiated principle of church discipline that excommunicates slaveholders." It will come as the logical and moral sequence, of Drs. Bacon and Thompson's type of "anti-slavery" as distinguished from, and forever in antagonism with, the "abolitionism" of Wesley, Edwards, Hopkins, and Cheever. The future student of our religious political and military history, will then know, what reflecting men may see now, that, in the process of such a triumph, the fall of Sumner, the repulse at Big Bethel, or even, should it occur, the capture of the Capital, would be less significant and decisive events than the victory of the ex-parte Council over the church of the Puritans, and with it the intended extinction of radical christian abolitionism in the churches of America. The destinies of a country, like ours, are controlled, for good or for evil, by its prevailing religion.

Note.—In this connection, it may be proper to state that out of the *Twenty-eight churches* (of which we are kindly informed) invited to participate in the ex-parte council of the church of the Puritans, there were only sixteen that accepted the invitation, while twelve declined. Of those declining, were the churches of Rev. Dr. Storr and of Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, of Brooklyn; of Rev. S. S. Jones, of Williamsburgh, (N. Y.) and of Rev. Dr. Jos. Hooper, Hartford, Conn.

A LETTER TO THE INDEPENDENT.

[The enclosed communication was refused by *The Independent* on the ground that its Editors are not under obligation to admit replies to their strictures on published documents.]

MESSEURS, EDITORS: The charge of malignity, denunciation, and "all uncharableness," has been so often made against Abolitionists, and so often disproved, that it seems hardly worth while now to notice the stale slander. It is more than ever unnecessary since one, of whom it was asked, not many years ago, as in confident challenge, "Is Dr. Tyng an Abolitionist?" has lately declared in public that slavery is a crime that ought to be abolished, and that shall be abolished, by the righteous war in which we are now involved, and that he is neither afraid nor ashamed to be called an Abolitionist.

But when a religious paper, with a circulation of tens of thousands, charges upon our Christian Society, as you have done in *The Independent* of June 6th, that "it systematically misrepresents and maligns in its published documents the Ministry and Churches of New England; the interests of truth, decency, and honor, on behalf of such a Society, that charge be met. And no less, in my judgment, does common sense, not to say the honor of professed Christian gentlemen, require that the reply to such a charge be admitted to your columns.

Replying, therefore, upon your sense of propriety and Christian courtesy to publish what I offer in denial of your charge, I proceed to meet it in the briefest manner compatible with thoroughness, intending to use an honest plainness of speech, and in so doing, although of necessity speaking in the first person, it will be my endeavor, not to outstrip the bounds of modesty, and to avoid anything like bitterness or personality. Let me then be understood as addressing you simply as Editors of the Independent, upon matters contained in your editorial columns.

The second Annual Report of the Executive Committee to the Church Anti-Slavery Society—from which you quote with treble notes of exaltation and italic type for a very innocent cause thereof, and with flaunting capitals for the inoffensive conjunction and, with which it is joined to the rest of the sentence—was adopted by the Society at its public Business Meeting in Boston, on the day of the late anniversary May 28th.

This Report, you say, "indicts the Ministry and Churches of New England collectively as faithless to anti-slavery, because unwilling to follow the beck of this particular Society. It says (yours being the italics):

"In the year of grace from May 1860, to May 1861, when the infamous slave trade was revived and exercised with a fearful activity and prevalence we knew how large the forty years, and when the country was passing through a political campaign of which, in the providence of God, the only really vital question at living issue was slavery—we have seen the various Ministerial Associations and Conferences of New England meet, pray, and sing and indulge in the customary platitudes, but make no pronouncement whatever upon slavery or the slave trade nor do anything at all to bring the verdict of Christianity and the Church to bear against it."

"In Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, the Congregational Ministry met in their annual assemblies and with the aggressions of slavery and the execrable slave trade in full view, and the Church Anti-Slavery Society knocking at their door, and asking friendly recognition and concurrence in its specific work of putting the practice of slaveholding under the opprobrium of Church prohibition, as the Scriptural way of abolishing slavery, they gave out the faintest token of sympathy with such a work nor did they discuss the subject in any way, nor did they propose any method of their own to make the Christianity of the nation effectively felt against the national sin of oppression."

Upon these paragraphs you found the indictment, that "the Church Anti-Slavery Society systematically misrepresents and maligns in its published documents the Ministry and churches of New England." And the only proof of the countenance which you offer is in these paragraphs. But your article closes with the following, which may well regard as an unbecoming and jesuitical fling.

"For a Society which has knuckled at every ecclesiastical door in New England without securing for itself friendly recognition or the faintest token of sympathy, to advise the Churches to give their recognition and fellowship to a Church which a strong Anti-Slavery Council, acting upon abundant evidence, has pronounced delinquent and disorderly, is not less amusing than impertinent."

1. Now, Messrs. Editors, I, in common with others, deliberately call this language jesuitical, and why? Webster defines jesuitical to be designing; cunning; deceitful; prevaricating. The language of yours above quoted (whether by reason of habit you are conscious of it or not I do not say) is designing and cunning, for, in the first place, it artfully insinuates, with an appearance of truth, what is not true, viz: that, by the Society's own confession, it has knuckled at every ecclesiastical door in New England, without securing for itself friendly recognition, or the faintest token of sympathy.

The Church Anti-Slavery Society has never asked recognition for itself, in any instance; but it has asked recognition and concurrence in its specific work of trying to put the practice of slaveholding under the opprobrium of Church prohibition, from three different State Associations, and from three only; and, in each of those three instances, with the same result, not the faintest token of sympathy with such a work. We do not say sympathy with the Society itself, but sympathy in its great work of rendering slaveholding infamous in the public eye, by putting it under the ban of excommunication by the Church, as the Scriptural way of abolishing slavery.

2. In the second place, your language is deceitful and prevaricating, for it artfully quibbles by an assumption which is not a fact, and then cunningly misleads the reader to the conclusion that there can be no moral weight to the advice given to the Churches, by a Society which has been unable to secure for itself any acknowledgment by those Churches, in its honest attempt to array them against slavery, and to procure from them an expression of Christian abhorrence of slaveholding.

It was obvious here to remark that the moral weight of a score of Christian men gathered in the Tremont Temple at Boston, in the Church Anti-Slavery Society, and possessed of published documentary evidence, is just as great as the moral weight of a score of Christian men gathered in an Ex-Parte Council at the rooms of the Geographical Society in New York, and possessed of the same published documentary evidence. And the Churches, not less than the community, will be just as likely to give heed to the advice of the one as of the other, only that they will lean, if anything, to the advice that was spontaneous and unsought, rather than to that which was planned and prepared for.

But in another place you are pleased to call this advice "a bit of drollery which is exquisitely refreshing." To whom it is refreshing we are at a loss to know, for to our-

selves, evidently, no far from being refreshing, this passage in the late proceedings of the Church Anti-Slavery Society is highly annoying.

3. Your language is jesuitical, again, when you say, quoting the opening paragraph of the Report:

"What an aspersions is this upon the fidelity of the Churches and the Ministry?—what an impertinent assumption, that because they have not seen fit to elect this Society as their representative, therefore they have not seen fit to be their part to cooperate efficiently with the majestic movements of Divine Providence for the overthrow of slavery."

That Messrs. Editors, is not our reasoning or conclusion, but it is your logic and your inference jesuitically palmed upon us. The Report, which so offends you, simply declares that it is to be deeply regretted that the professed Churches of Christ and the ministry thereof should not have seen it to be their part to cooperate efficiently with the majestic movements of Providence, the last year, toward the overthrow of slavery; and that it is also to be regretted that they should not have furnished the Committee of the Church Anti-Slavery Society with the means to have carried on, in the name of the Church, a more effective moral warfare with slavery.

The Report finds no fault with the Churches or the ministry for the reason that they have not seen fit to elect the Church Anti-Slavery Society as their representative. Nor has this Society ever asked to be so elected. But, in reviewing the past year, the Report truly says, that—

"While your Committee have seen much in the movements of Providence and the sympathy of churches and ministers toward the belief that the end of slavery is near, even at the doors, they have also seen, in the indifference or hostility to our philanthropic object and method evinced by Ministerial Bodies, benevolent Associations, Churches and religious newspapers, what has all along put them in grave doubt as to whether there was to be a peaceable or violent solution to the problem of American slavery—whether, in other words, Christianity was to get at the hearts of slaveholders, or whether the Church and the Ministry were to get at the throats of their masters, and take by force the liberty which they know to be their right."

4. This statement is strictly and undeniably true. For what is the philanthropic object and method of the Church Anti-Slavery Society? It is to put the practice of slaveholding under the opprobrium of Church prohibition, as the Scriptural way of abolishing slavery. In other words, it is to argue and enforce what you have signified as "the almost universally repudiated principle of Church discipline which excommunicates slaveholders." (in this method of abolishing slavery, by putting slaveholding (through the exclusion of the slaveholder) under the ban of the Churches, "as an immorality, the renunciation of which ought to be made a condition of membership in the Christian Church," was one of the General Associations or Conferences of New England Congregationalists, have during the last year, expressed any sympathy.

The nearest approach to it was made by the New Hampshire General Association, at its session in Claremont. But the resolution there adopted, carefully avoided the committing of that body to the doctrine of non-fellowship with slaveholders on account of slaveholding, and as carefully avoided the issue made in behalf of the Church Anti-Slavery Society.

5. The sources repeatedly misquoted by *The Independent* towards this Society, and the capacious spirit uniformly evinced on your part in speaking of it, are owing, we think, to our having taken and maintained the position that slaveholding, of itself, should be a bar to church fellowship and communion. This is the ground on which we hold that the Christianity of the nation ought to plant itself. But yourselves and no few other leading minds of the New England Ministry have rejected this as a dogma of uncharitableness, and have accused those who hold it as denials, toys and malignant and as filling with infidelity.

In your late article, entitled "Per Se Per Saltem," which, it may be presumed, is that especially which has led the Boston *Liberator* to say of *The Independent*, "whose moral balls, in every direction, is a slippery one,"—this dogma, article you characterize this view as the "per se" dogma, applied by a narrow school of conscientious questions of morality." And you very self-consciously add that "minds unskilled in logic have declared slaveholding, undefined, to

be *in per se*, making this dogma the text and test of opposition to slavery."

Here, if you mean anything, you mean to say that what we call the *in per se* school in this country we have never favored (that designation, nor have we dealt, at all, in Latin scholasticism) have all along been reasoning about slaveholding without knowing what they meant. That ambiguous and evasive term "slaveholding," you have said before, "makes all the mischief. Now, we deny that the term slaveholding is either ambiguous or evasive; for that we have never used it in any sense but its true one, or that we have never attempted to establish any new anti-slavery tests and definitions."

On the contrary, we assert, with entire confidence, that the ecclesiastical, historical and dictionary meaning of that term slaveholding, together with slave laws and judicial decisions innumerable, and common usage in the English tongue, have long since been agreed in making the term slaveholding to be and to express the holding of human beings as property. And that only is what Abolitionists have meant by it, according to your own virtual confession, in quoting the resolution of the American Anti-Slavery Society in 1845, which declares "that by slaveholding this Society understands the holding and treating of human beings as property, and maintains that to hold and treat a human being thus, is universally and always sinful, and ought to be everywhere immediately abandoned."

This is what the *in per se* school, as you designate it, the abstract right school, have invariably meant whenever they have used the term; and it is high time that the religious press in our country should have done with verbal legerdemain, puerile disputation, and hypocritical hair-splitting in regard to it.

6. What it apologists for American slavery, of the New York Observer type, in the pulpit, the Church, the editorial chair, in the great Associations of benevolence, have, before now, confused facts and confounded moral distinctions by the prefix applied to slaveholding? What, if, when the subject has been brought up by some honest Abolitionist in Synods, Assemblies, Minister's Meetings, and Boards of Missions, learned brethren have straightaway felt to talking about benevolent slaveholding, involuntary slaveholding, legal slaveholding, Christian slaveholding, useless slaveholding, innocent slaveholding, sinless slaveholding, and all to shield the slaveholder from having gilt charged home upon him? Yet the fact stands that the real and only meaning of slaveholding, by itself, is the holding of a human being as property, as a thing. That is American slavery, that is what Garrison and Goodell and their eloquent associates have been moving heaven and earth for, for the last thirty years; and that is what, in the all-wise providence of God, this country is at arms about, now.

And pleased as you might be, Messrs. Editors of *The Independent*, to have "our per se friends come over upon our side by a single hop," and much as it would suit you to "waive all past controversies of logic," it is not going to be waived, that Abolitionists have been along in the right, and are in the right still, in their principles, their premises, their terms, their logic, their conclusions, their warnings and their prophesies.

And we strongly suspect that what has chiefly troubled you, in the late Report to the Church Anti-Slavery Society, pumped up by so despicable an agency in your view as a "dokey engine," is the paragraph near the close which says, with special significance—

"And we have seen, finally, an influential religious paper at the North, the *independent*, make valuable service by holding the moral war with slavery, and that is now dealing the blows heavy and hot at the dying monster—we have seen that paper in order to save an assumed principle of its ethics, that slavery is not sinful in *se* and to prevent the moral odyssey of mankind and of the churches from settling down upon slaveholding, and the slaveholder reduced to the last shift of maintaining that the term slaveholding cannot be held as an invariable equivalent for holding human beings as property, and that, therefore, slaveholding is not inherently sinful."

7. You have said a good deal in your way, in disparagement of the Church Anti-Slavery Society while its defenders have been almost wholly excluded from your columns hitherto, just as the defenders of the Church of the Puritans have been excluded, while, with all the fury of partisans, you have persistently assailed that church,

The Principia.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JULY 13 1861

LETTERS on business for the *Principia* should be addressed to M. B. WILLIAMS, the Publisher.

Letters for the Editor, whether for his consideration, or for the public, should be addressed to WILLIAM GREGG.

ORDERS for books or pamphlets may be addressed to either of the above.

In all cases, the business matter should be on a slip of paper separate from suggestions or communications for the Editor, because business papers must be kept on the Publisher's file by themselves. For the same reason, what is designed for the Publisher should be on one slip of paper, and matter designed for the Editor's attention or use should be on another, though all may be put into one envelope, and directed to either.

All letters for us should be carefully directed to 329 Pearl street, and to 48 Beckman street, near to Box 1212. (The former address of Wm. Goulden, where some of his letters continue to be sent.) This is the more important note, as the office of our friends, is now moved, and letters directed there will be liable to be lost.

FEDERAL AND STATE POWERS—PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE—ORATION OF EDWARD EVERITT.

Politicians and especially political abolitionists are familiar with such topics as "Consolidation"—"State Sovereignty," "State Rights," "Nullification," and last, not least, "Secession." From the very birth of our Constitution, and before it, there have been two rival theories on the subject of either the *actual* or of the *desirable* relation between the State Governments and the National Government, if indeed the co-existence of the two were to have been regarded compatible, at all, for there have been grave doubts on that subject.

First on the question of having any National Constitution of Government, instead of the Old Confederacy of States—Second on the question of framing the Constitution, as discussed in the convention, *Third*, on the question of adopting the draft submitted by the Convention, *Fourth*, on the proper Construction of the Constitution immediately after it was formed, resulting in the famous Virginia and Kentucky resolutions of 1798. *Fifth*, on the proceedings of the Hartford Convention, during the British war of 1812, *Sixth*, on the attempt of South Carolina to nullify the Revenue laws, and now, *Seventh*, on the attempted secession of most of the slave States, in 1861—on each of these several occasions, the subject of State and Federal (or National) relations, has come up for earnest discussion, and debate.

One remarkable feature of the question has been,—as might have been predicted—that all the Federal Administrations, of all political parties, and all the Federal Courts, under all those administrations, have uniformly held to the Supremacy of the National over the State authorities, and have stood ready to vindicate and enforce the claim. In this particular, there is nothing of novelty, in the position of the present administration. It stands where all its predecessors have stood. The only peculiarity of the present crisis is that a forcible opposition is now made to the Supremacy of the National Government, involving the country in civil war, just as it would have been involved, under any other President, from Washington to Buchanan, inclusive, if any such forcible opposition had been raised. In all previous cases, the assertions of State Supremacy have stopped short of resorting to arms, unless Slay's rebellion and the Whiskey insurrection in Pennsylvania, both of which were soon subdued, be regarded exceptions. They cannot well be so regarded, as no State authority was enlisted in their favor.

In this it is involved, as another remarkable feature of the question, that the State Supremacy theory has been espoused only by minorities, for the time being, and while remaining minorities, all such persons and parties, uniformly changing their theory, for the opposite, the moment they come to be in the majority. We might conceive of such a possible event as that most, or even all of the States might assert the doctrine of State Supremacy as in opposition to National. As a matter of fact, however, such an event has not yet occurred. In the present controversy it has not. The only seeming exception, that of 1798, is not a real one, but the contrary. For although the political party that, while in the minority, rallied, on the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions, came into power with Mr. Jefferson in 1801,

it left its theory outside the Capitol and the President's House, before crossing the threshold of either. No Federal Administration was farther from yielding up Federal Supremacy to State Supremacy than that of Mr. Jefferson. No administration has ever made more extensive assertions in the consolidation of Federal power, unless it be that of Andrew Jackson, upon whom the mantle of Jefferson has, by common consent, been admitted to have fallen. And besides, no States except Virginia and Kentucky, previous to 1861, have ever affirmed or even assented to, the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions of 1798, unless the States represented in the Hartford Convention be claimed to have been exceptions, for a brief period.

It follows, as a third remarkable fact, that a *majority* of the people of the United States have, in every instance, and at all times, in our history, as a people, insisted upon, and thus far maintained the Supremacy of National over State authority. For illustration,

1. The people insisted on exchanging the Old Confederation of States for a National Government of their own. 2. The people ratified the Constitution which in its Preamble declared itself to be the Constitution of the people. 3. The people have always regarded the National Government to be a Government of the people. 4. The people in 1812 and 1832 frowned upon the attempts made, or supposed to be made, to override the National Government by State Governments. 5. The people are doing the same thing again now, in 1861. It was in open and notorious contempt of the people of the United States, and, in reality, of the people of the so-called seceding States themselves, that pretended acts of State secession from under the authority of the Federal Government have been passed. Give to the whole people of either or all those States, the real, matter-of-fact liberty and opportunity of voting intelligently, and without constraint, on the subject, and each and all of these States would vote against Secession, now. In saying this, we mean to include all the people, irrespective of hue or condition. With exception of one or two States, we might affirm the same, even ousting the colored people.

As political abolitionists—national abolitionists—looking for a national abolition of slavery, we have found this question of the relative position of State and National Sovereignty, a most important and vital one. It is by State, not National legislation, primarily, that the four millions of the American people are enslaved. From State legislation there is nothing to be expected in their favor. Political deliverance, if it comes at all, must come from the Sovereign Nation, not from the "Sovereign States." The slaveholders have always understood this, and have taken their position accordingly. The "State Sovereignty" doctrine is in fact their doctrine, devised for the very object of guarding slavery, and for nothing else. The ratification of the Federal Constitution was opposed in the Virginia Convention on this very ground, and the doctrine has now been reduced to practice by the leading slaveholders, for no reason but to preclude and prevent a National abolition of slavery, which they were sagacious enough to fear, however earnestly it may have been declined. *They* know, if others did not, that the Supremacy of a National Government of the people, was incompatible with the security of slavery. So long as the Federal Government could, on the slavery question, be controlled by the State Sovereignty theory, as certainly it never has been on any other subject, and thus subjected to their State Sovereignty, it was made their most efficient tool. But when they saw that their policy assailed by national abolitionists, and laid bare to public inspection, and when they witnessed the election of a President not absolutely pledged, at every point, to the Supremacy of slavery, they moment they resolved to overthrow National Supremacy by throwing it off, and to set it over-riding the National Government itself. They laid this sagacity to perceive that in no other way, could their "peculiar institution" escape ultimate extinction, by a Government of the Sovereign people. The fear was neither felicitous nor unfounded.

Last winter's discussions in Congress, and for two or three years previous, bear testimony to the fact that this was their great fear, and that they were driven into secession by it.

As the first blow struck at National Supremacy was struck in defense of slavery, so, in reality, though unintentionally,

and have done your utmost to defeat the honest mission of its pastor in its behalf in Great Britain.

But the time has come when both the Church Anti-Slavery Society and the Church of the Puritans must be heard for themselves in *The Independent*, where they have been, in the judgment of many, misrepresented and maligned, or the ministry and the churches will be apprised of the gross unfairness of our proceedings. To me it is anything but pleasant to say these things. But when, with what many call sippant arrogance, you indict as malignant and impertinent, the "published documents of the Church Anti-Slavery Society," which bear the honored christian names of Hon. J. Washburn of Worcester, Hon. Wm. Claflin of Newton, Rev. J. C. Webster of Hingham, and Lewis Tappan of New York, it is not for a christian minister in my humble position to keep silent.

I am well aware that I expose myself to your sore displeasure, and to your favorite way of manifesting that displeasure, by ridicule and scorn. But sneering and slander have little of terror to one conscious of rectitude, and impelled by duty. While I make no professions of stronger love for justice, or firmer devotion to principle than other honorable men, yet this I know; let me see or hear a wrong done to any man, and it awakens at once an outcry of indignation in my own soul. Nor can I tamely submit to wrong treatment in the case of a neighbor, or in my own case, without an indignant protest. The wrong itself I can sustain

'With temper, look to heaven, nor stoop
To think my injurer my foe.'
But to oppose oppression is a part of my religion. Nor can I help resisting tyranny and domineering in church or State, in a clique of ministers and editors, a committee of trustees or an ex-parte council, without doing violence or breachery to my own moral nature. In so acting, I know no fear of man, while I boast no courage.

But I should be untrue to the revered maternal example, and lessons of youth and manhood, did I not detect injustice in every shape. For this it is, that the poor man and the slave—the one often, the other always the victim of injustice—have my warmest sympathies and prayers. For this it is that I, an abolitionist, and that I have all ways declared myself such, and have stood by that worthy name when it was purposely used in opprobrium, as a synonym for fanaticism and infidelity.

For this it is that, without asking how it will affect my interests, when I see a desperate effort made to put down a man, a church, or a society, I spring to the defence, and I am ready to answer those that meet me as Placidus Priscus, a Senator of Rome, answered the Emperor Vespasian, when he threatened him with death if he spoke anything in the Senate but what he, the Emperor, would have him speak—"Do what you will, and I will do what I ought."

Also, that at this solemn season, under the mantle of judgment of the Most High God, for our great national sin of oppression, there should not be evinced by editors, ministers and churches, a clearer knowledge of the time of our visitation. Also, that we should not all be taking occasion, as one man, from our papers, our pulpits, and our prayer-meetings, quitting all our past antagonisms, to press home upon the suffering nation, its guilt in the matter of slaveholding, and to urge now, by the authority of God, upon the people and the government—not the wretched pretense "that we have no right directly to interfere with the institution of slavery"—but the peremptory duty of the immediate national abolition of the nuisance of slaveholding, and the proclamation of liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof, in the name of the people of the United States, and by command of the only living and true God.

Unless we do this, very soon, I greatly fear that the angle of divine forbearance will have been rounded by us, and that the decree will go forth, not then to be arrested by "many prayers" from an apostate and rotten church. ACTUS PRÆTERITUS PERISTIT. It is all over with thee—thou hast perished.

HEURY T. CHEEVER.
Jewett City Ct, June 11, 1861.
A PROPOSITION.—Mr. Cabotson said, ten years ago, in the Senate of the United States. The war will last between the seceding while there is a vote in the South. The conflict will never terminate. The South, I fear, will not see it, until it is too late. They will become more feeble every year, while the North will grow stronger and stronger."

the first blow struck in defence of National Sovereignty, as against State Sovereignty, was a blow struck at the hitherto unassailed *great fortress of slavery*. Carry that fortress, and the peculiar institution is lost, defenceless, to be disposed of, as the hearts and consciences of Christian freemen shall dictate. For, who does not know that every appeal to humanity, morality, religion, and love of liberty, for thirty years past, has been parried by the counter claims of "State Sovereignty," "State rights" and lack of *National supremacy over State Sovereignty*?

The slavery issue has, in this respect, been made an exception to all other issues. Every where else, the National Supremacy, as before stated, has been made to control State Supremacy. On the slavery question, alone, the theory has been reversed. Thanks to the Slaveholder's direct assault on the National Supremacy, the National existence, that exception, we think, is in process of being swept away, forever.

Just here it is, if we mistake not, that the cause of abolition has most to hope, from the present struggle. If the Federal Government is to be sustained, the theory of Federal Supremacy is to be sustained. The theory of State Supremacy is to be swept away, and that too, in a contest wherein, as the slaveholders themselves attest, the slavery issue presented the main question.

We have anxiously watched to see what course our intelligent statesmen would take, on so vital an issue. Would they attempt to dodge the great question between National and State Supremacy? To do so would be to dodge the main question between the Confederate States, so called, and the United States.

To vindicate it, hesitatingly, feebly, sophistically, would be more fatal to the Government than the fall of Fort Sumpter, Fortress Monroe, and every other Fortress on our coast. It would, in fact, involve the ultimate loss of them all. For armies and navies are composed of men. Revenues are furnished or are withheld by men. And men, especially in civilized communities, most of all in Republics, are controlled by ideas. And the ideas of a people are shaped by their leading men, their thinkers, their writers, their orators, their members of Congress, their Senators, their Presidents. A President's Message, at a time like this, to be what it should be, is of more importance than ten ordinary battles. It has battles, and it should have victories, wrapped up in it.

The past week, bare of military events, has brought us two battles, logical battles, of more importance to the war, than any four battles that have yet been fought, during the contest.

We allude to the President's Message and the Oration of Edward Everett, on the 4th of July, in the New-York Academy of Music, as published in the New-York Evening Post, of July 5. The oration is admitted to be the crowning effort of his oratorical powers. Apart from its wrong views of the direct slavery question, of which we need say nothing, here, it is indeed, a masterly effort. Like the President's Message, it triumphantly defends *National Supremacy* and cuts up *State Supremacy* by the roots. This was all the service to be expected from either of them, on those occasions, and this service they have effectually rendered.

The portion of the Message to which we allude we have recorded in our columns. Of the slavery question, direct, the President has said nothing new. We could wish he had said nothing at all. As it is, he had but briefly referred to his inaugural for his ultimate intentions. We let that pass. But on the question of National Supremacy, as against State Supremacy, he has done nobly. He has evidently studied his subject, and writes with rare originality of manner. Like other truly able writers, he says himself, as he should do, of the labors of others. We mistake if he has not availed himself of the writings of radical abolitionists. He notices, as John Quincy Adams had done, that the Declaration of Independence knows no *sovereign States* outside of the *United States*. He notices, what no other statesman or writer, except Radical Abolitionists, so far as we know, had before noticed, in the discussion of this subject, that there were *United Colonies*, before there were *United States*, and in order to the *existence* of States that there were no *States* nor *State rights* that did not grow out of a *pre-existing Union*. From facts like these *the* *Confederate*

vague theory of originally *Sovereign States* previous to *United States* is exploded in the Message, as a fallacy, to be repudiated as *fiction*.

We invite attention to the argument of President Lincoln, and ask that it be preserved and laid up, for use, in the future battles of freedom. That doctrine, established in the minds of the people, will soon sweep all the pretended compromises of the Constitution, favoring slavery, to the winds. All these supposed compromises rest on *expositions* growing out of the false theory that the Constitution describes and provides for a mere Confederacy of the States, and not a Government of the People of the United States. That "the people of the United States" should have a *Supreme National Government*, without the power and the obligation of providing all the inhabitants of the United States, is a theory quite too monstrous to be believed.

Messrs Lincoln and Everett, we repeat it, have done a notable week's work.

BROOKLYN, 7 July, 1861.

REV. WILLIAM GOODELL,

Dear Sir.—Rev. Jos. P. Thompson has called my attention to a passage in your paper, *The Principle*, of June 20th, beginning, "When Lewis Tappan was persecuted in the Broadway Tabernacle Church."

You had forgotten, when you wrote that paragraph, that the Broadway church, at the time, was a *Presbyterian* church, and that the "Broadway Tabernacle Church," as now existing under the pastoral charge of Mr. Thompson, was formed nearly two years after the persecution to which you allude. Mr. Hale, as you remark, defended the right of the individual concerned, both being members of the Presbyterian church at the time; and Mr. Thompson, his biographer, in his Memoir of Mr. Hale, applauded his course.

The pastor of the Broadway Church, at the time of the persecution, Rev. Joel Parker, was a Presbyterian, and he continues so to this day. I do not see how any body of Congregationalists so much could visit him with assurance for what he did as a Presbyterian, however justly they might censure him as a minister and a man.

I feel persuaded that you will be glad to make a correction as your statement affects a Christian Church, and the truth of history.

Very truly your friend and brother,

LEWIS TAPPAN.

P. S. On page 675, 1st column, you allude to the Fulton Street prayer meeting. The meetings are now open to remarks and prayers respecting slavery.

REMARKS. We are glad to make these corrections. We had indeed overlooked the change in the ecclesiastical relations of the Broadway Tabernacle Church, and were not aware in the change of organization, "two years afterward." The readers of our Review, we think, will have seen that our statement involved no censure of Rev. Dr. Thompson, "the present pastor," in that matter, as we distinguished him from "the pastor who led on the persecution." So far as denominational church polity is concerned, we admit that Presbyterianism, not Congregationalism is responsible for the proceedings. Whether the present church should be considered identical, as a local church, with the one whose name it continues to bear, we will not undertake to determine. A great change of members has doubtless taken place. We hope that the present church will take care that they do not cry the example of their predecessors, in this matter, by exhibiting in similar persecutions, on a larger scale, and thus "allow the deeds of their" predecessors. [Luke xi, 48.]

We are also glad to learn that Dr. Thompson approved the labors of David Hale, in vindicating a persecuted abolitionist. We shall hope, ultimately, to receive his approbation also, for vindicating large numbers of abolitionists, under still more aggravated persecutions, from a more widely extended and more numerous band of persecutors, operating in the use of more extraordinary methods.

We are truly rejoiced to learn, for the first time, that the Fulton Street prayer meetings are now open to remarks and prayers respecting slavery. This is worth publishing through all Christendom. The world moves, and the Church moves with it, instead of moving the world, as it should have done.

News of the Day.

OPENING OF CONGRESS.

Congress met in extra session, on Friday July 4, the first session of the new Congress recently elected, contains many new measures.

GILBERT A. GROSVENOR, of Pennsylvania, was elected Speaker of the House of Representatives, and EDWARD EVERETT, of Massachusetts, Clerk. On taking the oath of office, Grosvenor made an eloquent speech, stirring compromise in favor of an energetic support of the government, a sentiment was enthusiastically received. One of the marked passages of the speech was the following:

"No flag alien to the shores of the Mississippi, will float permanently over its mouth, till all its waters are crimsoned in human gore, and not one foot of American soil can be grenched from the jurisdiction of the United States, until it is baptised in fire and blood [Vociferous applause upon the floor and in the galleries lasted for many minutes.]

The applause was of course out of order, and its reception was discontinued by the Chair.

The "Special" Institution? received a dexterous thrust, in the following sentence.

All parties, sects and conditions of men, not corrupted by the institutions of human bondage, forgetting bygone errors or prejudices, blend in one phalanx for the integrity of the Union, and the perpetuity of the republic.

THE SENATE was called to order by the Vice President Mr. Hannin.

The following Senators were present

Messrs. Anthony, Bayard, Ringham, Breckinridge, Bright, Chandler, Clark, Collamer, Cragin, Dixon, Dodge, Fessenden, Foster, Grimes, Hale, Harlan, Johnson, Howe, Johnson of Tennessee, Kennedy, King, Lane of Kansas, Latham, Morrill, Newcomb, Pearce, Polk, Pugh, Saulsbury, Sherman, Sumner, Sumner, Ten Eyck, Tilden, Treadwell, Wade, Wilkinson and Wilson.

The President's Message is a loud, plain, straightforward document. Whether the critics will do it the literary execution or not, the common people will understand it, and like it all the better for the absence of an actual structure and embellishments. It treats largely the history of the four months since the President came to office. It details the story of Fort Sumter, speaks of forbearance of the government, of the defensive measures employed, of the course of Virginia, of the fallacy of a policy of privatizing, of the suspension of the Habeas Corpus, of the sympathy of foreign powers for the Union, of the patriotism of the people, of the wisdom of the leaders, of the doctrine of secession, of the rebel policy among the people, of the leading object of the Union, of rebel appeal from the ballot box to the sword, of the sense of authority in public servants, on such an issue, compromise. It calls for troops and funds to carry on war.

On this latter topic, the only business submitted to Congress, the President says

It is now recommended that you give the legal vote for making this contest a short and decisive one; that you elect the central of the movement, for the cost of \$400,000 in men, and \$100,000 in arms. That number of men about one tenth of those of proper age within the region, where, apparently, all are willing to engage, and the defeat of the twenty-third part of the money voted by the men who seem ready to devote the whole. A debt of six hundred millions of dollars now, in a less sum, would have been the debt of our Revolution, when we elected our first President, and the money, and the arms, and the men, bears even a greater proportion to what it was then, than the population. Surely such men has as strong a motive now to preserve our liberties, as each had then to uphold them.

A right result at this time will be worth more to the world, than ten times the men and ten times the money. The evidence reaching us from the country, leaves no doubt that the sacrifice for the work is abundant, and that the right will have the help of the people, and the hand of the Executive to give it practical shape and efficiency.

From present appearances it seems probable that the proposed measure will be promptly adopted by Congress without any distracting discussion of compromises, and to the people of the Union will with great unanimity, approve their course. We say probably, remembering that there is still a border State element in Congress, and more or less of sympathy with them, on the part of some Northern members. Time will soon decide.

men under Captain Patton, was fired upon by a company of male Union men near Stearns, and many of the guard were wounded. It has been killed, and W. and Patton were severely wounded. There appears to be no doubt that such a skirmish occurred, but the reports relative to Gen. Wise need confirmation.—Times.

Yellow fever. The recent Ohio Congressmen, visited the Ohio regiments near the Potomac yesterday, and was reported a terrible state of affairs in that direction. It was reported that Dr. Wilson, Dr. Selman, and other leading Union men had been hung. In some cases the escaping fugitives had been followed into Kansas by the secret police.

From Kansas.—Lawrence, July 6.—Fugitives from Jasper county (Missouri), are hourly arriving at Fort Scott, and report a terrible state of affairs in that direction. It was reported that Dr. Wilson, Dr. Selman, and other leading Union men had been hung. In some cases the escaping fugitives had been followed into Kansas by the secret police.

Wednesday, with 400 men entered Missouri on the morning of the 27th ult., but his object has not yet transpired.—World.

Maryland.—Baltimore, July 6.—Secretary Cameron and party arrived here this morning from Old Point, to take the afternoon train for Washington.

Two large and two boxes filled with powder were secreted in the western police station. A small number of arms were also found.—lb.

The Steamer Cataline, recently destroyed by fire, was, it is said, chartered to the Government for service on the Potomac, at the rate of \$10,000 a month, by Thurlow Weed and two party. If this statement be correct, Thurlow and his associates had a "big job"—the whole value of the boat being less than two months charter price. Thurlow will have to make another explanation. Of course, it is not to be supposed that his "particular friend" in Washington had any interest in the contract.—Sun. [Continued.]

Marine Telegraphs. A letter from England says:— " vast improvements in everything relating to the structure of telegraph cables are constantly being made, and inquiry upon the subject is very active. We in America are much more hopeful of a good time for the Atlantic Cable.—Sun.

The late fire.—London. The loss by the conflagration in London was over two millions sterling. Some of the insured are as high as three or four millions. Nearly all insured.—lb.

The House of Representatives has just taken a test vote on the question of prohibiting all ordinary legislation during the extra session, especially with a view of cutting off all attempts to compromise measures. The vote stood 102 yeas to 52 nays. So the compromisers are at a discount.—Post.

TUESDAY PM.
Gov. Hicks, of Maryland, was in Washington to-day. He represents that on the eastern shore there is much rebel feeling, and is anxious that a force should be sent down to afford Union men protection.—Times.

The Eastern shore is the strong hold of slavery in Maryland. "To afford Union men protection" there, requires the abolition of the slaveholding oligarchy. Nothing else, (with out a perpetual standing army) will suffice. Nothing more is needed. Will the Government afford the protection in the cheapest the only sure and permanent method? If not, why not?—Post.

Congress. In the House, yesterday, Mr. Lovejoy offered the following resolutions:

1. Resolved, that in the judgment of this House it is no part of the duty of the soldiers of the United States to capture or return fugitive slaves.
2. Resolved, that the Committee on the Judiciary be instructed to inquire into the expediency of repealing the law commonly called the Fugitive Slave law.
3. Whereas, Major Emory, of the United States Army, resigned his commission under circumstances showing sympathy with rebellion against the Government; therefore,
Resolved, that his restoration to the service was improper and unjustifiable, and that this House in the name of the people demand of the Executive his immediate removal.

On motion of Mr. Edwards, the Resolutions were laid on the table by yeas against 62.

Among other important motions adopted, was one made by Mr. Louis of Connecticut, instructing the Judiciary Committee to prepare and report a bill to confiscate the property of all rebel soldiers found in arms against the government.—Times.

A flag of truce from the rebel borne by Col. Thomas Taylor, was brought into Col. Tyler's camp on the Virginia side, yesterday afternoon. Col. Taylor was immediately escorted to the headquarters of Gen. McDowell, when it was ascertained that he was the bearer of dispatches for General Lincoln. Col. Taylor said that the President had demanded his Cabinet at once and consultations were held during the evening with Gen. Scott. The meaning of

all this is, of course, impossible to explain, and it is unsafe even to surmise an event.—lb.

WEDNESDAY PM.

The Times.—Rome, July 9.—The Starbuck an extra, saying:—Col. Taylor, who came either under a flag of truce yesterday, says that his business was disposed of at the White House in a very few moments for in that time he was sent back to Gen. Scott with one letter less than he bore on his person on entering the United States line, this President not deeming the communication he brought such as required him to enter into any communication with the rebels.

Col. Taylor was next immediately faced in the direction from which he came, and marched back to Gen. McDowell's headquarters, where through courtesy, he was kindly treated. He was, however, kept under a strict guard until an early hour this morning, when he was escorted back to the confederate lines and turned loose to find his way back to Beauregard, without having accomplished what was evidently a main point to be attained by his mission, namely, to communicate with the traitors in our midst, who had doubtless prepared to send to Beauregard, through him, important information concerning the alleged contemplated movement of Gen. McDowell's army upon the "Confederate lines." The Starbuck says: Although the President has communicated the exact contents of the letter from Davis brought by Col. Taylor, to no one besides his (the President's) constitutional advisers and Gen. Scott, yet from certain signs, we are able to assure the public that it amounted to nothing of earthly importance in the present crisis."

Congress. Fugitive Slaves. In the House, yesterday, Mr. Lovejoy (Rep. Ill.) introduced a resolution that, in the judgment of the House, it is no part of the duty of soldiers of the United States to capture or return fugitive slaves.

Mr. MALLORY (Kent., Ky.) moved to lay the resolution on the table.

Mr. STRATTON (Dem. N. J.) raised the point that the resolution is not admissible under the order adopted yesterday prescribing the business of the session.

The SPEAKER, for reasons given, overruled the point.

Mr. CAMPBELL, of Virginia, unsuccessfully, sought to submit an amendment to Mr. Lovejoy's resolution.

Mr. STRATTON, without meaning disrespect to the Speaker, appealed from his decision.

Mr. HITCHCOCK (Dem. Ohio) moved to lay the appeal on the table, which was agreed to.

The SPEAKER, therefore, was sustained.

Mr. CAMPBELL, of Virginia, again respectfully appealed to Mr. Lovejoy to withdraw his demand for the previous question on the passage of his (Lovejoy's) resolution, he (Campbell) desiring to offer an amendment to the same.

The main question was then ordered, and Mr. Lovejoy's resolution was passed by a vote of 92 against 55.

"So far, so good," the Resolution was an enactment, nor would it be if concurred in by the Senate. But it will have influence.

THURSDAY PM.

The loan bill was yesterday taken up in the House of Representatives, and passed by a vote of 149 Yeas to 1 Nays. The Nays were as follows: Messrs. Bailett, Rice, Nixson, Vallandigham, and Ben Wood.

The Army bill was passed, appropriating 287,500,000 for various purposes specified. The Navy bill appropriates, 30,000,000 more.

Battle in Missouri. At Carthage, Missouri, Col. Seigel, with 1,500 Federal troops, met Gov. Jewell, with a much larger rebel force, (some accounts say 10,000). After a sharp conflict, both armies seem to have retired, and 85 bodies and a quantity of arms were carried off by Col. Seigel. Of the loss of lives, on each side, the accounts are very conflicting.

Family Miscellany.

GATHERING FLOWERS.

Gather the flowers that blossom low,
Deep in the dew like a transient gem;
Gather the buds that stately rise,
Two of a pillar, and three on a stem.
"Yes," said my child, "I'll gather them well
For which is the sweetest I cannot tell."

Gather the flowers that speak of hope,
Scouting the breath of the morning hour;
Gather the buds that only bloom
When night comes apace, or the tempest howls.
"Yes," said my sweet one, "for both are bright
One's for the sunny day, the other for the night."
And in it not strange, she gently said,
As she did down the dew like an April's bud
That she had chosen these, so oft I've been led
To thank you for summer flowers, and for flowers
That bloom in the night, for both are bright and true.
On the words, said she, as a leaf of God's book."

—W. S. in the Dia

THE PHANTOM.

B. BYARD TAYLOR.

To appreciate the delicate and touching points of this poem, it must be borne in mind that the Poet in early life, like most others who commune with the Muse, became a fond lover. The fair object of his devotion was in feeble health, and the nuptial day, on that account, had been deferred from time to time, till at last, it became evident that she must yield to the destroyer. A few days before her decease, she became the wife of Bayard Taylor. After that sad event, the distracted widower became a traveller, and after roaming around the world for some years, he came home and poured out his whole soul in these lines.

Again I felt within the man
In the old familiar seat,
And shade and sunshine chase each other
O'er the carpet at my feet.

But the sweet sister's arms have wrestled upwards
In the summer that are past,
And the willow trails its branches low,
Than when I saw them last;
They strive to catch the sunshine wholly
From out the haunted room;
To fill the house, that once was joy,
With silence and with gloom.

And many kind remembered faces
Within the doorway come—
Voices that make the sweetest music
Of one that now is dumb.

They sing, in tones as glad as ever,
The songs she loved to hear;
They breathe the rose in summer gardens,
Whose flowers to them were dear.

And still, her footsteps in the passage
Her blushes at the door,
Her timid words of maiden welcome
Come back to me once more.

And, all forgetful of my sorrow,
Unmindful of my pain,
I think she has but just been with me,
And soon will come again.

She stays without, perhaps, a moment,
To dress her dark brown hair;
I hear the rustle of her garments,
Her light step on the stair.

O flatterer hie! control thy tumult!
Lest eyes profane should find
The cheeks that hied thee from my capture
Her coming brings to me!

She taries long, but lo! is welcome
Beyond the open door,
And gliding through the quiet sunshine
A shadow on the floor.

Ah! 'tis the whispering pine that calls me
The vine whose shade she strays;
And my patient heart must still await her
Nor chide her long delays.

But my heart grows sick with weary waiting
As many a time before—
Her foot never at the threshold
Yet never passes o'er.

WE SLEEP TOO LITTLE

But if night, and not day, is the time to sleep, then it may be said that the general principle prevails, that the amount of sleep should be regulated by the dividing line between light and darkness, and that this view may be accepted as the correct one, is determined from analogy—it being true that animals except it and act upon it in the temperate latitudes, which are supposed to be the most favorable for the development of the human organism in its highest proportions. Take the year together, day and night are about equal; and were mankind, within these latitudes to live according to the laws of life and health in other directions, they would sleep while darkness is on the face of the earth, and be active only during the period in which light was abundant. As a habit and fashion with our people, we sleep too little. It is admitted by all those who are competent to speak on the subject, that the people of the United States from day to day, not only do not get sufficient sleep, but they do not get sufficient rest. By the preponderance of the nervous over the vital equipment, they need all the recuperating benefits with sleep can offer, each night, as it passes. A far better rule would be to get at least eight hours sleep, and, including sleep, ten hours of incubation rest. It is a sad mistake that some make, who suppose

demerits qualified to speak on the subject, in affirming that persons of a highly-wrought, nervous temperament, need—as compared with those of a more lymphatic, or stolid organization—less sleep. The truth is, that where power is expended with great rapidity, by a constitutional law, it is re-gathered slowly—the reaction after a while demanding much more time for the gathering up of new force, than the direct effort demands in expending that force. Thus a man of the nervous temperament, after he has established a habit of overdoing, recovers from the effect of such over-action, much more slowly than a man of different temperament would, if the balance between his power to do and his power to rest, is destroyed. As between the nervous and the lymphatic temperaments, therefore, where excess of work is demanded, it will always be seen that at the close of the day's labor, whether it has been of muscle or thought, the man of nervous temperament, who is tired, finds it difficult to fall to sleep, sleeps perturbedly, wakes up excitedly, and is more apt than otherwise to resort to stimulating and place himself in conditions of pleasurable activity. While the man of lymphatic temperament, when tired, falls asleep, sleeps soundly and uninterrupted, and wakes up in the morning a new man. The facts are against the theory that nervous temperaments recuperate quickly from fatigues to which their possessors are subjected. Three-fourths of our drunkards are from the ranks of the men of nervous temperament. Almost all opium-eaters in our country—and their name is Legion—are persons of the nervous, or nervous sanguine temperaments. Almost all the men in the country who become the victims of narcotic drug-medication, are of the nervous or nervous-sanguine temperament. That the very general habit of dependence upon stimulants, or stimulant-narcotics, is almost entirely confined to persons of the nervous temperament, shows that the taxations to which they subject themselves, are not readily reacted from; and that under their methods of living, they find it difficult to depend upon the natural force to make good their losses within the time they allot for that purpose. The rule, therefore, should be the other way from that which it is supposed to be—namely, that persons of highly wrought nervous organization need but little sleep. It should be the habit with such persons to sleep largely, and to insist upon such freedom from exercise, both of body and mind, and such external conditions of repose, as gradually to bring the brain to acknowledge such relations to the general structure, as will enable its various organs to become so refreshed, that they may, when duty is resumed, perform with accustomed yet healthy vigor.—*Dr. J. C. Jackson.*

ALL RIGHT: OR, TRUE OBEDIENCE.

"ACENT Mary, may I go up on the top of the house and fly my kite?" asked Henry Alfred one day. Henry was a visitor in the city and almost a stranger to his aunt. He saw the little boy on the tops of the neighboring houses flying their kites with great success, and the thought struck him that he would have special fun if he could do the same. His aunt of course wished to gratify the boy in all reasonable enjoyment, but deemed this particular feat very unsafe; and though she did not know how it might affect Henry, she felt that she must refuse his request.

"I don't want you to go, Henry," said she. "I consider that a very dangerous thing for a little boy like you to attempt."

"All right, then, I'll go out on the bridge," replied Henry.

His aunt smiled. "I hope you'll always be as acquiescent, my lad," said she to herself.

"Henry what are you doing?" called his mother on another occasion.

"Spinning my new top noother."

"Can't you take the baby out to ride? Get out the carriage, and I'll bring him down."

"All right, obedient the boy, as he put his top in his pocket, and hastened to fulfil his mother's request.

"Aunt Mary may I go that errand for you? I know I can find the place, and I like to find my way round the city so much.

"Well, you go straight down P street to F, and then cross that and a little further down is J street. Go into that and out three blocks down—oh no, Henry, if you no

never can find it. Wait until Robert comes home and you shall go with him.

"All right," was the cheerful reply.

"Uncle William, may I go over to your store this morning? I want to get those baskets again I was looking at yesterday."

"Oh yes, Henry I shall be very glad to have you."

"But I can't spare you to-day, Henry," said his mother.

"I want you to go out with me; you shall go to the store another time."

"All right," responded the child.

No matter what request was made of Henry, what wish of his was refused, what disappointment or task it was necessary to impose upon him—his uniform answer was, "All right." Not a word of expostulation or teasing was uttered—no "why can't I," or "must I," or "do let me," or "I don't want to," was ever heard from his lips. His aunt thought he was a model for all boys.

"This is obedience that is worth something," said she, "prompt, cheerful, uniform and unquestioning. Pity all boys and girls were not like Henry. What a comfort they would be to their parents—ay, and to themselves too. What a deal of vexation, trouble, and sorrow they might save."

And it thought what a pity God's children had not this same spirit of ready, uncompromising submission. To say, "All right" to the appointments of our Heavenly Father, would be indeed pleasing to him. To enter with alacrity upon every duty, to receive uncomplainingly each needed infliction, to bear without murmuring the numerous disappointments of life, to be satisfied with any arrangement. Infinite Wisdom may see fit to make for us—ah, this indeed would honor God, and be fruitful of improvement, peace, and happiness to ourselves. So would our whole lives be an utterance of that sentiment which multitudes deem so hard, "Not my will, but thine be done;" and the "peace of God which passeth all understanding" would flow like a deep quiet river through the soul.—*Independent.*

H. F. B.

OPPOSITES IN RELIGION

"Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is, but exhorting one another, and to insist upon the more, as ye see the day approaching."—*Paul.*

"I believe I'll stay at home to-day, as it is rainy and I don't like to go and spend my time listening to Bro. W., for he can't preach much, anyhow."—*Fair Weather Laziness.*

"Pray without ceasing, and in everything give thanks, for this is the will of God in Christ Jesus concerning you."—*Paul.*

"I can't find time to pray, and then I have so many things to attend to, and my mind is so taken up with the business of the day that I am not prepared to pray."—*Worldly-mindedness.*

"See that none render evil for evil unto any man, but ever follow that which is good, both among yourselves and toward all men.—*Paul.*

"My neighbor has done me so much evil and has acted so badly that I will not stand it any longer; I'll make him know that I have rights, as other men, and I'll make him respect them.—*Revenge.*

"Strive to enter in at the straight gate."—*Christ.*

"All will be made holy and happy, and there is no danger.

—*Presumption.*

"Content earnestly for the faith, once delivered to the saints."—*Jude.*

"Don't preach doctrinal sermons, or you will offend some people."—*Pain-Heartedness.*

"Withdraw from every brother that walks disorderly and have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them."—*Paul.*

"If ye withdraw from Brother B, he will do us all the injury he can, and I think we had better let him alone."—*Triumph.*

"Seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness."—*Christ.*

"As soon as you get settled in life it will be easy for you to serve God, but you cannot well do it before.—*Satan.*

"They that preach the gospel should live of the gospel."—*Paul.*

"I think we should preach for nothing, or at least should follow some other business for their living."—*Correct.*

BEAUTIFUL IDEA.

In the mountains of Tyrol, it is the custom of the women and children to come out when it is bed-time and sing a national song until they hear their husbands, fathers, or brothers answer them from the hills on their return home. On the shores of the Adriatic such a custom prevails. There the wives of the fishermen come about sunset singing a melody. After singing the first stanza, they listen while for an answering melody from off the water, and continue to sing and listen till the well-known voice comes on the waters, telling that the loved one is at home. How sweet to the weary fisherman, as the sea gulls around him, must be the songs of the loved one at home, that sing to cheer him; and how they must strengthen and tighten the links that bind together the busy dwellers by the sea.

THOMAS JEFFERSON ON INSURRECTIONS.—"I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just and that his goodness will not sleep forever. The slaveholders has no tribute which will take sides with [slavery] as it is a contest."

There is a certain charm about great superiority of intellect, that winds into deep affections. Genius makes enemies, but it makes sure friends—friends who for much, who endure long, who exact little; they partake the character of disciples as well as friends. There lies about the human heart a strong inclination to look up—to reverence; in this inclination lies the source of religious loyalty; and also of worship and immortality which are desired so cheerfully to the great of old.

Knowledge is a tree. We must plant it when we young, if we would enjoy its fruit and shadow when we are old. It requires a life-long growth to reach its full maturity and its richest fruits. Besides, the germ flourishes and grows fastest in the virgin soil of the young mind.

BUNTON'S DAILY LIFE.—An intimate friend of The FOWEL BUNTON says of him: "He walked through the w like a man passing through the wards of a hospital, stooping down, on all sides, to administer help where it needed."

WRITINGS OF WILLIAM GOODELL.

For sale at the office of the *Principia*? For Cash ONLY.
DEMOCRACY OF CHRISTIANITY, 2 Vols., \$1 50—Postage 32
SLAVERY AND ANTI-SLAVERY (History of) 1 Vol., \$1 00 Postage 16
AMERICAN SLAVE CODE, 1 Vol., \$2 50—Postage 16

OUR NATIONAL CHARTERS.

FOR THE MASSES, NINTH EDITION
I. The Federal Constitution of 1787-2.
II. The Articles of Confederation, 1778.
III. The Declaration of Independence, 1776.
IV. The Articles of Association, 1774.

With notes showing their bearing on slavery, and the powers of the State and National Governments. Also, a private copy, and a copy of the original, and a copy of the original, collected from the highest authorities, is prefixed to the Constitution. An Appendix contains extracts from State Constitutions, and a full and complete history of 1787, including slavery from Northwest Territory; also, sentiments of the Revolutionary fathers.

PRICES OF "Our National Charters."
By mail, postpaid, by the Publisher.
Single copy, 15 cents.
For 4 copies, 50 "

Single copy, 12 cents.
For 4 copies, 48 "

In packages of more than 20 or 30 copies it is generally cheaper to send by freight. (Where it can be done) than by Mail. But this may depend on the distance and directness of the route, and may be ascertained by experiment, or by inquiry at the nearest Express depot.

For sale by WILLIAM GOODELL, or M. B. WILLIAMS, Office Principia, 301 Pearl Street, New York. Terms: Cash advanced.

N.B. All postages on Books, Pamphlets, and Tracts, must be at our Post-Office "in advance," that we cannot answer for price of the publication.

Also, for sale, above,
Spencer's Unconstitutionality of Slavery.

In paper covers, price 75 cents. postage 13 cents. In cloth, 82 "

82 " We have no books, pamphlets, or tracts for sale, those advertised, above, and it is not convenient for us to send orders for any others.